Table 2-3
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action*
1	Andrew Lake Waste Ordnance Demolition Range	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Environmental site assessment (Hart Crowser 1993) PSE-1 (URS 1994a) PSE-2 (URS 1996a)	CERCLA	• Need to establish long-term institutional controls due to presence of UXO. • Need to conduct range assessment. • Need for removal of 2 leaky drums and affected soil. • Need for limited confirmation sampling of soils below 2 leaky drums. • Gather data to perform FS for remedial alternatives.	• Remove drums containing petroleum contents. Collect and analyze confirmation samples during RI field effort. • Restrict site access by maintaining institutional controls to protect from UXO hazard. • Evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls. • EOD to conduct UXO survey (which was completed in 1996). • A risk evaluation/FS for petroleum sites will be conducted to address risk associated with petroleum contamination.
2	Causeway Landfill & Minefield	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1993a) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	<u>Landfill</u> • Resample sediments to verify presence or absence of COPCs. • Collect one surface water sample to verify that COPCs in landfill are not significantly affecting surface water. • Verify that there are no COPCs at ecological exposure endpoints. • Evaluate biota ingestion pathway for recreational receptors at Clam Lagoon. • Gather data to perform FS for remedial alternatives. <u>Minefield</u> • Conduct a range assessment (UXO) of the minefield. • Restrict access to minefield.	<u>Landfill</u> • Collect analytical samples and take water level measurements from existing on-site monitoring wells. • Resample/analyze sediments during RI field effort. • Collect surface water sample from Clam Lagoon directly downgradient of landfill sampling location with highest TPH. • Verify that there are no COPCs in surface water or sediments and ensure that cover eliminates direct exposure to landfill. • Evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls, to prevent future residential use and to ensure that landfill cover remains undisturbed. <u>Minefield</u> • EOD to conduct UXO survey (which was completed in 1996). • Implement institutional and/or engineered controls to restrict access.

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action[a]
3	Clam Lagoon Landfill	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1993a) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per EPA correspondence (April 27, 1995) and ADEC correspondence (May 12, 1995).
4	South Davis Road Landfill	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1993a) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• Resample sediments to verify presence or absence of COPCs. • Collect one surface water sample to verify that COPCs in landfill are not significantly affecting surface water.	• Resample/analyze sediments during RI field effort. • Collect surface water sample from Andrew Lake directly downgradient of landfill sampling location with highest TPH. • Perform ecological assessment. • Evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls, to ensure that site is not developed for residential use and that landfill cover is not disturbed.
5	North Davis Road Landfill	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1993a) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per EPA correspondence (April 27, 1995) and ADEC correspondence (May 12, 1995).
6	Andrew Lake Drum Disposal Area 1	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• Need for additional sediment and groundwater data and determination of groundwater flow direction.	• Install 3 to 4 wells and collect groundwater samples and water levels during RI field effort. • Resample sediments.
7	Andrew Lake Drum Disposal Area 2	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• Fill groundwater data gaps regarding gradient and flow direction. • Provide additional groundwater chemistry in support of the basin-wide RI. • Need for additional surface water data.	• Install 2 wells and collect samples and water levels from existing and 2 new wells during RI field effort. • Collect surface water and sediment samples during RI field effort.
8	Andrew Lake Landfill & Shoreline	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b) PSE-2 (URS 1996a)	CERCLA	• Need to maintain institutional controls due to presence of UXO. • Need to conduct range assessment for UXO. • Need to collect data to perform feasibility analysis of all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls.	• Restrict site access by maintaining institutional controls. • Evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls. • EOD to conduct UXO survey (which was completed in 1996).

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action*
9	Black Powder Club	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per EPA correspondence (April 4, 1995) and ADEC correspondence (April 13, 1995).
10	Old Baler Building	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1995c)	CERCLA	• Presence of low concentrations of SVOCs, PCBs, and metals in soils.	• Cumulative risk is less than 10^{-4} for Adak residential, recreational, and occupational receptors; evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls.
11	Palisades Landfill	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Review of remedial option (URS 1994e, 1995a)	CERCLA	• Exceedance of State of Alaska ARARs. • Preference for presumptive IRA by FFA project managers.	• Completed the IRA, which consisted of placement of 3 feet of cover on upper landfill area, construction of swales to control surface water, and vegetation; and collected samples of downgradient surface water, sediments, and mussel tissue. • Monitor post-IRA to determine protectiveness of IRA and need for further action.
12	Quartermaster Road Debris Disposal Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b) UST site assessment (URS 1995m) Debris site assessment (URS 1995n) UST site assessment (URS 1995o)	SAERA	• Petroleum in soils.	• Defer site to SAERA process: further investigation is planned under the risk evaluation/FS for petroleum sites.
13	Metals Landfill	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Review of remedial option (URS 1994e, 1995a)	CERCLA	• A presumptive IRA has been approved & will be summarized in the RI/FS. • Preference for presumptive IRA by FFA project managers.	• Completed the IRA, which consisted of placement of 3 feet of cover on upper landfill area, construction of swales to control surface water, and vegetation; and collected mussel tissue samples. • Monitor post-IRA to determine protectiveness of IRA and need for further action.
14	Old Pesticide Disposal Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994a) PSE-2 (URS 1996a)	CERCLA	• Presence of VOCs in groundwater. • Presence of chemicals in groundwater that may originate from off-site sources.	• Site risk is less than 10^{-4}; evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls. • Restrict development of downtown groundwater for use as a drinking water source. • Evaluate presence of chemicals detected in on-site wells versus those in upgradient groundwater well, which likely did not originate at SWMU 14, as part of downtown-wide groundwater nature and extent evaluation during RI.

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action[a]
15	Future Jobs/DRMO (Former Hazardous Waste Storage)	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) Site investigation (URS 1993b) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Removal action (URS 1993c) Groundwater monitoring program (URS 1994d, 1995b) PSE-2 (URS 1996a)	CERCLA	• Presence of SVOCs, PCBs, & pesticides in soils & sediments; VOCs in groundwater. • Need to conduct off-site characterization of sediments in Sweeper Cove to evaluate possible migration of chemicals from all downtown CERCLA sites.	• Cumulative residential risk is less than 10^{-4}; evaluate all remedial alternatives in FS, including institutional controls. • Evaluate possible downgradient impacts in basin-wide RI.
16	Former Firefighting Training Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) Removal action (URS 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Site investigation (URS 1993b) Treatability study (URS 1992c) Groundwater monitoring program (URS 1994b) PSE-1 (URS 1994a) PSE-2 (URS 1996a)	CERCLA	• Presence of PCBs in sediments; cPAHs, PCBs, VOCs, & inorganics in soils; VOCs & PCBs in groundwater. • Presence of soil containing PCBs in excess of 10 mg/kg.	• Conduct limited removal action of PCB-bearing soils at one location; soils with greater than 1 mg/kg PCBs will be disposed of off island. This work to be done outside of the RI/FS. • Non-PCB stockpiles to be removed outside of the RI/FS. • Cumulative risk to any human receptor is less than 10^{-4}; evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls. • Evaluate possible downgradient impacts in the basin-wide RI. • Include site in the FS.
16A[b]	PCB Stockpile Area	Engineering evaluation/cost analysis (URS 1996f)	CERCLA	• Need confirmation sampling as part of the removal/remedial action.	• Remove or treat stockpile outside of the RI/FS. Soils with less than 1 to 50 mg/kg PCBs will be moved to SWMU 67. Soils with greater than 50 mg/kg will be disposed of off island.

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action*
17	Power Plant 3 Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Site investigation (URS 1993b) Treatability study (URS 1992c) Groundwater monitoring program (URS 1994d) PSE-1 (URS 1994a) PSE-2 (URS 1996a)	CERCLA	• Presence of the following: cPAHs, PCBs, pesticides, & inorganics in sediments; cPAHs, PCBs, & inorganics in soils; VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs, organics, & petroleum product in groundwater; and VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs, pesticides, & inorganics in surface water.	• Currently, recovering free product in groundwater by installation of an interceptor trench & product reuse at the power plant. • Leak tested the buried fuel distribution system at the site. • Evaluate the relative impacts of chemical effects on the pond versus habitat destruction that would result from remediation. • Stabilize the waste oil pond check dam to prevent collapse. • Improve/repair plant discharge & oil/water recovery systems. • An IRA has been approved and will be summarized in RI/FS. Note: Work to be completed independently of RI.
18	South Sector Drum Disposal Area (now part of White Alice Landfill)	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	• Because this site is located within what is now the permitted White Alice solid waste landfill, all future actions at the site will be conducted as part of the closure required under State of Alaska regulations for this facility.	• See recommendations for SWMU 19.
19	Quarry Metal Disposal Area (now White Alice Landfill)	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	• Because this site is located within what is now the permitted White Alice solid waste landfill, all future actions at the site will be conducted as part of the closure required under State of Alaska regulations for this facility.	• Implement further action according to permitting requirements for operating landfill, which dictates groundwater monitoring. • Design landfill cap in anticipation of closure.
20	White Alice/Trout Creek Disposal Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) Site investigation and removal action (URS 1993b) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Removal validation inspection (URS 1994c) PSE-1 (URS 1994a) PSE-2 (URS 1996a)	CERCLA	• Cumulative risk is slightly above the human health and ecological risk target maximums of 10^{-6} and 10, respectively.	• No further action is recommended.

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action*
21A	White Alice Upper Quarry	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Site investigation and removal action (URS 1993b) PSE-1 (URS 1995c) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• Address inspection of cover that exists over a portion of the site.	• No further action per a meeting between the Navy, ADEC, and EPA.
21B	White Alice Lower Quarry	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1995c) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• The possibility that PCBs have migrated downgradient to sediments in Trout Creek will be addressed. • The possible human health risks that a future quarry worker may be exposed to will be addressed.	• Per EPA correspondence (May 24, 1995), further followup work should be completed as part of the downgradient SWMU 20 PSE-2 study. Per ADEC correspondence (June 2, 1995), a future worker exposure scenario should be evaluated in the November 1995 PSE-1 report. No COPCs were identified in downgradient sediments at SWMU 20. The future worker scenario was evaluated in the PSE-1; therefore, no further action is required.
21C	White Alice East Disposal Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) RCRA closure (URS 1995v) PSE-1 (URS 1995c) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• EPA requested more complete evaluation of all field observations and laboratory data in PSE-1. • ADEC requested evaluation of future worker exposure scenario along with the evaluation of surface water as a potential drinking water source.	• Per EPA correspondence (May 24, 1995), the treatment of the site in the PSE-1 was revised. Additional evaluation revealed no new issues. No further action is required.
22	Drum Storage South of Tank Farm A	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Limited field investigation (URS 1995f)	SAERA	NA	• No further action per ADEC correspondence (March 15, 1995).
23	Heart Lake Drum Disposal Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1993a)	CERCLA	• Sediment samples may have been biased. • Need for summary of results from 1995 limited removal action of sediment.	• Resample sediments to verify the presence or absence of COPCs. • Summarize findings in the FS. Evaluate alternatives, if necessary.

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action*
24	Hazardous Waste Container Storage Facility	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) RCRA closure (URS 1995v)	RCRA	• All actions now completed being pursued under separate FFCA.	• No further action.
25	Roberts Landfill	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991)	CERCLA	• This site is a properly permitted landfill, and all further actions at the site will be conducted as part of the closure required under State of Alaska regulations for this facility.	• Implement further action according to permitting requirement for an operating landfill, which dictates groundwater monitoring. • Design landfill cap in anticipation of closure.
26	Mitt Lake Drum Disposal Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per meeting with EPA on January 8-9, 1996, and ADEC correspondence (April 13, 1994).
27	Lake Leone Drum Disposal Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b) Drum/debris removal validation investigation (URS 1994c) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• Sediment samples may have been biased. • Verify that site does not pose unacceptable risk to ecological receptors. • Evaluate remedial alternatives (if necessary).	• Resample sediments to verify the presence or absence of COPCs. • Re-evaluate ecological risk with the new data. • Site risk does not exceed 10^{-4} for any human receptor; evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls. • Evaluate possible downgradient impacts in the basin-wide RI. • Include site in the FS.
28	Lake Betty Drum Disposal Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b) Site assessment (URS 1995k)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per EPA correspondence (April 4 and May 24, 1994) and ADEC correspondence (May 31, 1995).

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action*
29	Finger Bay Landfill	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1993a) PSE-2 (URS 1995d) Groundwater sampling (URS 1995i)	CERCLA	• Sediment samples may have been biased. • Drums of unknown (but apparently innocuous) white substance are present in the stream. • Additional groundwater data are warranted. • Verify that site will not be used for residential development and that landfill cover is not disturbed. • Verify that ecological risk due to exposure to sediments is not significant and that there is no exposure endpoint within the landfill.	• Resample sediment to verify the presence or absence of COPCs. • Sample groundwater. • Attempt source identification for previously detected benzo(a)pyrene. • Drums located in the stream were removed in 1996.
30	Magazine 4 Landfill	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1993a) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• Sediment samples may have been biased.	• Resample sediments to verify presence or absence of COPCs. • Verify that there is no apparent source at site.
31	Runway 18-36 Aviation Gas Drum Disposal Area	Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Limited field investigation (URS 1995f)	SAERA	NA	• No further action per ADEC correspondence (March 15, 1995).
34	Steam Plant 4 Used Oil Storage Area	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Limited field investigation (URS 1995f)	SAERA	NA	• No further action per ADEC correspondence (March 15, 1995).
35	GSE Used Oil Tank	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Tank closure assessment (S&W 1993)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
41	GSE Used Oil Storage Area	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Limited field investigation (URS 1995f)	SAERA	NA	• No further action per ADEC correspondence (March 15, 1995).
42	GSE Steam Clean Oil/Water Separator	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1993a) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• Ensure that oil/water separator continues to function properly and that adequate maintenance is being performed.	• No further work if unit is no longer in use; if in use, only normal maintenance is required.
43	AIMD Acid Battery Storage Area	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per EPA correspondence (October 19, 1993) and ADEC correspondence (April 13, 1994).
44	AIMD Used Oil Storage Area	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Limited field investigation (URS 1995f)	SAERA	NA	• No further action per ADEC correspondence (March 15, 1995).

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action[a]
45 46 47 -48 49 50	Sewage Treatment Plant[c]	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Limited field investigation (URS 1995f)	SAERA	NA	• No further action per ADEC correspondence on March 15, 1995.
51	NSGA Transportation Bldg. 10354 Waste Storage Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Environmental site assessment (S&W 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1993a) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per EPA correspondence (October 19, 1993) and ADEC correspondence (April 13, 1994).
52 53 59	Former Loran Station[d]	Preliminary assessment (U.S. Navy 1990b) Site inspection/removal action (URS 1991) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Removal action (URS 1992b) UST removal action/closure assessment (S&W 1994b, 1994c) PSE-2 (URS 1996a)	CERCLA	• Presence of SVOCs, PCBs, & inorganics in soils. • Potential for presence of live ordnance on site.	• EOD to investigate potential UXO on site and evaluate the need for institutional controls. • Restrict access to buildings.
54	NMCB Battery Storage	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per EPA correspondence (October 19, 1993) and ADEC correspondence (April 13, 1994).
55	Public Works Transportation Dept. Waste Storage Area	Multi-media inspection (U.S. EPA 1989a) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Stormwater study (E&E 1995) PSE-2 (URS 1996a)	CERCLA	• Presence of trace PCBs & inorganics in sediments. • Presence of trace PCBs & VOCs in soils. • Presence of trace VOCs in groundwater.	• Implement institutional controls to restrict groundwater use as drinking water. This will be evaluated for groundwater as a whole in the downtown area. • Without groundwater exposure, cumulative risk is less than 10^{-6} and no further action is warranted.

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action*
56	Public Works Transportation Dept. Storage Tank	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Release investigation work plan (EMCON 1996b)	SAERA	NA	• No further action per the risk evaluation/FS for petroleum sites (in progress).
57	Refueling Dock Oil/Water Separator	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Release investigation work plan (EMCON 1996b)	SAERA	NA	• No further action per the risk evaluation/FS for petroleum sites (in progress).
58	NSGA 10348 JP-5 Tank	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Site assessment (URS 1995j)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
60	Tank Farm A	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) Release investigation (EMCON 1995a)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
61	Tank Farm B	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Release investigation (URS 1994f)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
62	Housing Area Fuel Leak	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Product recovery project (EMCON 1995b)	SAERA	• Free product in groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
64	Tank Farm D	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Release investigation (URS 1994f)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
65	Contractor's Camp Fire/Demolition Site	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	• A data gap for surficial soils exists; no soil data are available in area where burned material is located.	• Collect surficial soil samples to verify the presence or absence of COPCs.
66	Palisades Lake PCB Spill Site	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per EPA correspondence (October 19, 1993) and ADEC correspondence (April 13, 1994).

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action*
67	White Alice PCB Spill Site	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Site investigation (URS 1993b) UST removal (S&W 1994a) PSE-2 (URS 1996a) Engineering evaluation/cost analysis (URS 1995b, 1996f)	CERCLA	• Presence of comparatively high concentrations of PCBs in soils.	• Remediation by installation of low-permeable cap has been tentatively approved.
68	New Pesticide Storage Area	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action.
69	Ski Lodge Waste Pile	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b) Site assessment (URS 1995l)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per EPA correspondence (April 4 and May 24, 1994) and ADEC correspondence (May 31, 1995).
70	Davis Road Asphalt Drums	PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per October 19, 1993, meeting with ADEC and EPA.
71	NSGA Fueling Facility	Site assessment (URS 1995p)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action.
72	NSGA Transportation Bldg. 10354	RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) Site assessments (S&W 1990, 1991, 1992) UST investigation (Hertzog 1993) PSE-1 (URS 1993a) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	SAERA	• Because fuel constituents in soil and groundwater are present and fuel storage tanks were formerly present on site, the site has been deferred to the SAERA process.	• Defer site to SAERA process; further investigation is planned.
73	NSGA Oil/Water Separator	Site assessment (URS 1995q)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
74	Old Batch Facility	Preliminary assessment (U.S. Navy 1990a) Site inspection (URS 1992a) Groundwater monitoring program (URS 1994d) PSE-1 (URS 1995c)	CERCLA	• Presence of low concentrations of SVOCs, PCBs, & metals in soils.	• Cumulative risk is lower than 10^{-4} for all human receptors; evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls.
75	Asphalt Storage Area	Site inspection (URS 1992a) PSE-1 (URS 1995c)	CERCLA	• Presence of low concentrations of SVOCs, PCBs, & metals in soils.	• Cumulative risk is lower than 10^{-4} for all human receptors; evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls.

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action*
76	Old Line Shed Bldg.	Site inspection (Tetra Tech 1989) Site inspection (URS 1992a) PSE-1 (URS 1995c)	CERCLA	• Presence of low concentrations of SVOCs, PCBs, & metals in soils.	• Cumulative risk is less than 10^{-4} for Adak residential, recreational, and occupational receptors; evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls.
77	Fuel Division Area Drum Storage	Site assessment (Linder 1996)	RCRA	• All action now completed was pursued under FFCA.	• No further action.
78	NSGA Transportation USTs	Release investigation work plan (EMCON 1996b)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
79	Main Road Pipeline	Release investigation (URS 1994f)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
80	Steam Plant 4 USTs	Site assessment (URS 1995s) Limited field investigation (URS 1995f)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
81	NSGA Gun Turret Hill USTs	Tank removal (Hertzog 1993)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
82	NSGA P80, P81 USTs	Site assessment (URS 1995r)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
83	Former Chiefs Club Station	Tank removal (Hertzog 1993)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action.
84	Sand Shed	Site assessment (URS 1995u)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
85	New Baler Bldg.	Limited field investigation (URS 1995f)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
86	Old Happy Valley Child Care Center	Limited field investigation (URS 1995f)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
87	Old Zeto Point Wizard Station USTs	UST closures (Quest 1993b, 1993c, 1993d)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
88	NSGA P70 Energy Generator UST	UST closure (Quest 1993a)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
89	Tank Farm C	Site assessment (URS 1995t)	SAERA	• Fuel constituents in soil and groundwater.	• Further investigation planned under SAERA.
90	Husky Road Landfill	Response to ADEC Notice of Violation issued 1987	CERCLA	NA	• No further action.
91	Airplane Crash Sites	PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	NA	• No further action per meeting with ADEC and EPA (October 19, 1993).

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

SWMU or SA No.	Names	Previous Investigations	Regulatory Process	Rationale for Further Evaluation	Recommended Action[a]
92	Waste Ordnance Pile (Fin Field)	PSE-1 (URS 1994b) PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• Previous groundwater sampling was aborted due to discovery of UXO. • Confirmatory sampling has not been performed following the removal of napalm bombs and incendiary bomblets. • Additional on-site and downgradient data are desired.	• Install 2 wells aborted due to UXO. • Conduct sampling of soils, groundwater, sediments, & surface water within boundary of drainage area & at Scotty Lake.
93	World War II Mortar Impact Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) RCRA facility assessment (SAIC 1991) PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	• In support of the RI/FS, establish level of effort necessary for performing UXO identification and removal. • Need for collection of data regarding presence and extent of UXO, as well as completion of feasibility analysis of all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls.	• EOD to conduct UXO survey (which was completed in 1996). • Evaluate all remedial alternatives, including institutional controls, because of the possible presence of UXO on site.
94	Chemical Weapons Disposal Area	Initial assessment study (NEESA 1986) PSE-1 (URS 1994b)	CERCLA	• Uncertainty remains as to the presence of weapons at some sites.	• Inspect and photograph the subject areas and perform additional research to determine if no further action is warranted.
95	Transformer Disposal Area	PSE-2 (URS 1995d)	CERCLA	• Confirmation samples have not been evaluated.	• Evaluate confirmation sample results (results indicate no further action is justified.)

[a]Under "Recommended Actions," the word "evaluation" refers to the need for further interpretation of data and discussion with regulatory agencies; the word "investigation" refers to the need for additional sampling and laboratory analysis. Note also that some recommendations (e.g., implementation of institutional controls) have been made before the completion of a formal FS.
[b]SWMUs 16 and 16A are combined as one FFA site.
[c]SWMUs 45 through 50 are combined as one FFA site.
[d]SWMUs 52, 53, and 59 are counted as three separate FFA sites.

Notes:
AIMD - Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Detachment
ARAR - applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement
CERCLA - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980
COPC - chemical of potential concern
cPAH - carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
DRMO - Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office
EOD - Explosive Ordnance Disposal
FFA - Federal Facilities Agreement
FFCA - Federal Facilities Compliance Agreement
FS - feasibility study
GSE - Ground Support Equipment
IRA - interim remedial action
NA - not applicable
NMCB - Naval Mobile Construction Battalion
NSGA - Naval Security Group Activity
PCB - polychlorinated biphenyl

Table 2-3 (Continued)
Summary of Previous Investigations and Recommended Actions for FFA Sites

PSE - preliminary source evaluation
RCRA - Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RI - remedial investigation
SA - source area
SAERA - State-Adak Environmental Restoration Agreement
SVOC - semivolatile organic compound
SWMU - solid waste management unit
TPH - total petroleum hydrocarbons
UST - underground storage tank
UXO - unexploded ordnance
VOC - volatile organic compound